

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

And

FALLBROOK DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting

Monday 21 September 2009, 7:00 P.M., Live Oak School, 1978 Reche Road, Fallbrook

MINUTES

Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM by Mr. Jim Russell, who led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

15 members were present, Anne Burdick, Jean Dooley, Donna Gebhart, Tom Harrington, Ron Miller, Roy Moosa, Steve Smith, Paul Schaden, Harry Christiansen, Jack Wood, Michele Bain, Jackie Heyneman, Eileen Delaney, Jim Russell and Bill Bopf.

1. Open Forum. Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Planning Group on any subject matter within the Groups jurisdiction but not on today's agenda. Three minute limitation. Non-discussion & Non-voting item.

Mr. Russell read a proclamation recognizing Mr. Bowen's 16 years of service as a planning Group Member and 14 years as the Group's Secretary. The Proclamation was presented to Mr. Bowen on September 5, 2009.

Mr. Monty Voigt brought to the Planning Group's attention the proposed pole change out (wood to steel) that SDG&E is undertaking on Highway 76 between Pala and Monserrate (the Pala to Monserate Wood to Steel Pole Replacement Project). The major concern he had was, as he understood the project, higher voltage would be hung on the new poles but cable TV and phone lines would not require some wood poles to remain. Additionally the review period for public comment was very brief and he felt that SDG&E should extend the comment period and hold a public meeting. Mr. Russell encouraged all interested parties to contact SDG&E and the Public Utilities Commission with any concerns they may have with this project.

2. Approval of the minutes for the meetings of 17 & 24 August 2009. Voting item.

Mr. Harrington informed the Group that the August 24th minutes were not included in the package. Ms. Burdick motioned to approve the August 17 minutes and the Group approved the motion with Mr. Bopf and Ms. Delany Abstaining since they were not present. .

3. Request from the San Diego County Department of Parks and Recreation for an update to the CSA81/Fallbrook Community Planning Group requests for projects for the Park Land Dedication Ordinance funds for 2009/2010. County planner Mark E. Massen, Senior Park Project Manager, 858.966.1351, mark.massen@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Parks & Recreation Committee**. Community input. Voting Item. (8/11)

Ms. Gebhart reported for the Parks and Recreation Committee that they had reviewed the parks project priority list and agreed with the projects listed. A parcel at the end of Vine Street had been identified as a possible additional park site (60' X 200' lot). The site currently had a block wall across it that has been identified by the Sheriff as problem area in the community. The Parks and Recreation Committee felt that if the block wall were removed that the lot would make a reasonable location for a pocket park and could possibly eliminate some of the problems that the Sheriff was dealing with. The Committee voted to add the Vine Street parcel to the bottom of the list. After limited discussion, Ms. Gebhart motioned to approve the current list of projects with the addition of the Vine Street parcel added to the bottom of the list and the Group unanimously approved the motion.

4. TPM20451/**MUP** Request to subdivide the 5.40 acres located on the north side of Canonita Drive between Tecalote Drive and Old Highway 395 into two lots for a 4.08 acres biological Open Space and one lot for 3 condominium units. Owner Jodi Schnoeblen 858-496-2525/760-489-6375. Contact person Thury Stedt, TRS consultants 619-299-2525. County planner Kristina Jeffers 858-694-2604 kristina.jeffers@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item (8/12)

Mr. Stedt presented the project. The main issue with the development was that additional Open Space was required for environmental reasons and this required clustering the proposed three units very close together in the westerly portion of the parcel. Mr. Stedt noted that this clustering would be consistent with the surrounding townhomes and condos. Mr. Wood reported that the Land Use Committee had concurred with the request. Mr. Russell questioned if a Homeowners Association would be set up to control and maintain the common space. Mr. Stedt verified that there would be a Homeowners Association. Mr. Wood made a motion to approve the project as presented and the Group unanimously approved the motion.

5. TPM21167/STP09-017 Request to subdivide the 8.93 acres located at 1585 Tecalote Drive (southwest corner of Tecalote Drive and Puerta Del Mundo) into 2 lots for 2 single family dwelling units. The existing house on lot #1 will remain. Owner and contact person Jeffrey Garner 760-451-0630. County planner Emmet Aquino 858-694-8845 emmet.aquino@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Land Use and Design Review Committees**. Community input. Voting item. (8/17)

Mr. Garner presented the project which was to split the parcel into two lots. The existing dwelling would remain intact (on the Northerly parcel) and a new dwelling would be built on the Southerly parcel. Mr. Wood reported that the Land Use Committee had concurred with the request. Ms. Delaney stated that the Design Review Committee had no objection to the project but had requested exhibits of the proposed color scheme, which Mr. Garner had produced at the meeting. She further stated that after review of the exhibits she had no further objections to the project. A member of the audience and neighbor of the project voiced concern about possible power poles obstructing their view. Mr. Garner assured the neighbor that all new utilities would be undergrounded. Mr. Wood motioned to approve the project as presented and the Group unanimously approved the motion.

6. TPM21168/GPA09-008/REZ09-005/AP09-001 request to subdivide the 14.98 acres located at 2774 Los Aqlisos Road into 4 lots plus a remainder for five single family dwelling units. The existing residence on the remainder parcel will remain. Additionally there is a General Plan Amendment request to change from (Ag Preserve 20) to Estate (17), a rezone request to change the lot size from 1 du per 10 acres to 1 du per 2 acres, and an Ag Preserve vacation to remove the Williamson Act designation from the property. The property was in the Williamson Act from 1977 to 1999. Owner Bela Family Trust 626-803-9062. Applicant Gertrude Bela. Contact person Hadley Johnson 760-728-3209. County planner Mark Slovick 858-495-5172. **Land Use Committee**. Community input. Voting item. (8/24)

The Applicant presented the proposed parcel map. He illustrated the fact that the rezone request would bring the property closer to the zoning of the surrounding properties. Also the requested zone change would be in compliance with the current and proposed general plans and community plans. Additionally the applicant pointed out that the Agricultural Preserve on the property had been removed several years ago but the County had not updated the designation on this property and this action would also correct that issue. Mr. Wood reported the site inspection and County research had verified the points made by the applicant but the County had submitted a notification that a trail easement would be required along Los Alisos. An adjoining property owner commented on a drain problem in the vicinity of the proposed entry road to the new parcels. She stated that the large trees in the area shed leaves to such an extent that the drain under Los Alisos was blocked regularly. Mr. Johnson stated that most if not all of the problematic trees would be removed when the new road was put in and the storm drain pipe itself would most likely be upsized.

Mr. Wood motioned that the project be approved with the additional requirement of a trail or pathway along Los Alisos and the request that DPLU and DPW review the drainage issue at the entry way. The motion was unanimously approved.

7. Request for Waiver of "B" Community Design Review Special Area Regulation. Project: Convert SFD & detached garage to market & office, 6 parking spaces provided in front yard setback (7.7 required). Current zoning C-37 Location: APN:104-123-14-00; 212 ; 212 Aviation. Contact: Juan Sebastian, 760-419-2074. Planner: Debra Frischer, debra.frischer@sdcounty.ca.gov. **Design Review Committee**. Community input. Voting Item. (8/28)

The applicant was not present. Mr. Delaney noted that the applicant had not brought all the required information to the Design Review Committee meeting and motioned to continue the request and the motion was unanimously approved.

8. The Meadowood Project; GPA 04-002, SP 04-001, REZ 04-004, TM 5354, S04-005, S04-006, S04-007, MUP08-024. Review the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and the General Plan Amendment & Specific Plan Amendment for the Meadowood Project located on the 866 acres just north of SR-76 approximately ¼ mile east of I-15. The DEIR identifies significant environmental impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Transportation, Traffic, Biological Resources, Agricultural Recourses, Geology and Soils, Cultural Recourses, Noise and Hazardous Materials. Comments on the proposed DEIR must be received no later than 12 October, 2009 at DPLU, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, CA 92123. The DEIR can be viewed at the Fallbrook Library, the Valley Center Library and the Vista Library as well as on the county web site at; http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/ceqa_public_review.html. Contact person: Jimmy Ayala, Community Development Director, Pardee Homes, 858-794-2500 or Jimmy.Ayala@pardeehomes.com. County planners Dennis Campbell DPLU Project Manager, 858-694-3737 & Kristin Blackson, Environmental Coordinator, 858-694-3012. **Land Use, Circulation, Public Facilities, Parks & Recreation and Design Review Committees**. Community input. Voting item. (8/28)

The Applicant did not appear in this matter. Mr. Russell explained that due to the Draft Environmental Impact Report comment period deadline the Planning Group was compelled to make its concerns known at this time.

Mr. Wood reported on the Land Use Committee's Concerns:

WATER Revisiting history of RMWD and Meadowood, it was noted that the original agreement was to provide a sewage treatment plant, but nothing about water. RMWD ultimately backed out of agreement. Because of no water supply.

Other facts that cloud the issue is that LAFCO will do nothing unless the water district requests annexation. It is entirely up to the District. All regional Districts support this concept.

No water district has agreed to supply water.

Conclusion. – No water availability for housing or sewage treatment plant.

Non-compliance - The assumption of approval is irrational logic based on inconsistencies with Fallbrook Community Plan, the SD General Plan, and the I-15 Corridor Design Review standards. In addition, comparison with Rancho Viejo is ludicrous in that this project was begun, altered, and progressed all without FCPG approval.

Conclusion - Too many obstacles in numerous areas of each of the above documents.

SCHOOL Strenuously object to 12 ½ acre set aside for only 2 years at which time it would revert to housing. In the current economic climate, school construction funding is questionable.

Conclusion – 12 ½ acres school property (which may not be of adequate size) must remain available with no time frame.

DENSITY – Since the density is based on entire acreage, the number of dwelling units exceeds reasonable limits. Multi family alley-loaded units are particularly problematic with totally inadequate parking. (i.e. 9' x 19' garages and no room to park and unload). In addition, open space in MF area is totally inadequate. These factors create more problems than they solve. From the beginning of this project we have expected no more than 650 units to be built on this land. The 844 (or 869 if the school land is considered) units requested far exceed those expectations.

Conclusion – Density is too great and inclusion of alley loaded multi//family housing destroys the “rural Fallbrook” look that is expressly pointed out in the plan and EIR

Grading- 2.4 million cubic yards of grading is planned to build this project. In some areas this leaves 80'-

100' slopes which changes the natural terrain dramatically, and violates the Fallbrook Community Plan. .

Conclusion – Grading is inconsistent with rural character of Fallbrook.

Transit node

This County concept is not evident in this plan (only a bus stop) or in other plans for this area. LU Committee would like an idea of what the Transit Node vision is.

Bill Bopf made a motion indicating that all the areas listed above have not been properly addressed in the DEIR. Motion carried unanimously.

Further the Land Use committee observed that the 3 projects are so integrally related that they cannot be addressed individually.

It was reported that Pappas, Campus Park West had approached the Fallbrook Hospital District to offer 20 acres for purchase. The District turned down the offer for now.

Mr. Wood reported on the Circulation Committee's concerns:

Since a quorum was not present, no motions were made and no voting occurred. A discussion did occur however, with the following conclusions

1. Horse Creek Ranch Road needs to extend as a four lane road to the Stewart Canyon underpass to avoid a bottleneck of traffic caused by a four lane road reduced to two lanes.
2. An interchange is needed at Stewart Canyon; especially since there will be a great deal of traffic attending the Palomar College campus from Riverside. An e-mail was sent by Sid Morel to Supervisor Bill Horn regarding this need.
3. The project school is improperly located, too close to the Bonsall School District boundary. It should be closer to Highway 76 near Lake Rancho Viejo.
4. Parking for the entire project is inadequate. Cars cannot be parked in front of garages without spilling into the alleyways, which will encroach on fire truck access.
5. The definition of a transit node is too vague. The draft EIR only addresses a bus turn out and does not address park and ride or transfer stations, which will be needed for this area.
6. The Traffic Impact Fees need to be applied to the areas that are affected by the project paying the fees.

The final consensus by all was that the entire project is inconsistent with the Fallbrook Community Plan. The 5000-6000?? square foot lots are not consistent with the character of Fallbrook.

Ms. Burdick reported on the Public Facilities Committee's concerns:

Water Issues

Water and Wastewater issues need to be considered for ALL projects in the I-15/76 area before selecting any single project for approval.

Demonstrate that adequate water is available on a sustainable basis and that project approval does not have a negative impact on existing water users, both for imported supplies and current groundwater supply.

EIR must provide evidence to support the DEIR's following conclusions about water:

- MET assessment that.....reliable water supplies are available to 2030. (4-42)
- MET can "meet demands" based on latest data from April, 2009. (4-46)
- Proposals for Offset programs (4-50) need details and evidence.
- Does not acknowledge that these 5-year studies did not include the effects of the delta smelt decision, the severity of drought, or the reduced supplies from the Colorado River. Only acknowledges "unforeseen challenges" - p. 4-51
- "The EIR must explain, however, given these factors, that water is still available" (4-51) (*implying that they don't have to explain for the DEIR?*)
- "There is sufficient water supply to service the Proposed Project and the existing and other certain planned projects in the SDCWA area." (4-55)
- All water conclusions discussed in the DEIR are based on incomplete and outdated data. Their analyses do not account for the effects of the third year of drought, the delta smelt decision, or reduced supplies from the Colorado River.

Explore the feasibility of permits for individual dwelling units to install "grey water" recovery systems for localized irrigation.

Appendix O-1 (May 2009)

Irrigation Systems will be owned and managed by the Meadowood HOA, and a Recycled Water Site Supervisor will be required who answers to the HOA - how will this work?
Consider the feasibility of having the Common HOA Areas managed by an independent firm (HOA's have a spotty record of self-enforcement.)

OFFSET programs

Based primarily on use of groundwater :

(421 AFY extra + 197 AFY used for irrigation) p 2-12

Need to provide details for other offset proposals:

Develop new sources

Recycled water outside project

Desalinated water

Groundwater

Contradictory Information: Appendix L - "The Proposed Project does not propose groundwater usage except during the drier months as a secondary source of irrigation...." But they have already offered their groundwater as their Offset.

Appendix O-2 (June 2009) - Information needs to be based on current data.

Water Supply Tables based on April 2007 Update

"no shortages are anticipated within the Water Authority Service area"

New April 2008 Five Year Supply Plan

- "identifies new supplies for MET to consider"
- "demonstrates" that firm demands on MET can be met.

Concludes that "Independent of the LAFCO determination of the ultimate water service provider, an adequate supply of water is available from the Water Authority to serve the Meadowood Project's demands." (p. 17)

Wastewater

Ensure that Project approval is contingent on availability of wastewater treatment and disposal sewer service commitment prior to land preparation.

Treatment Plant so close to homes - need details on treatment basins.

Landfill

Discussion on landfills assumes that Gregory Canyon will be operational. EIR should consider viable alternatives if Gregory Canyon is not available. (p. 4-26)

School

145 students in FUESD will be assigned to Fallbrook Street School, Live Oak Elem. (4-27)

191 students in the Bonsall District would be served by a new school

Inconsistent number of students referred to in various parts of the DEIR, as well as inconsistent numbers of dwelling units to determine the number of students.

If no school, then Meadowood proposes 42 additional DUs -

The committee recommends that school acreage be undeveloped and held for future school.

Has proper consideration been given to the increase in high school students generated by the Meadowood project, given that the Fallbrook High School is already at over-capacity?

Law Enforcement

1. Acceptable response time for priority calls is 8 minutes, 2005 response time for the Meadowood area was 11.9 minutes. (4-28)

2. New sheriff's station at I-15 is not scheduled to be available until at least 2019.

Energy

Insufficient discussion in Chapter 8 -Mitigation

Need to address solar energy, photovoltaic, grey water recovery, and renewable energy.

Explore emerging energy technologies such as Regional biomass/biogas and dwelling unit solar energy generation.

Backwards Approval Process:

“Supervisors approve project first, then LAFCO will assign water and sewer district.”

Ms. Delaney reported on the Design Review Committee's concerns:
Design Review Committee has commented on sections within:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT Summary of Findings sections 1-5

VISUAL IMPACT EVALUATION Conclusions 3. Subsections 1-3

MEADOWOOD RESIDENTIAL DESIGN-Site Design & Architecture

General Comments:

DEIR has Numerous times stated that this project is inconsistent with regional and general plans. We agree.

Changing and/or amending Land Use and Zoning elements or designations, as well as the General Plan and Fallbrook's Community Plan will not mitigate any of the significant impacts that have been identified. It would just allow the project to be built.

The Meadowood Specific Plan Amendment and Design process would not change the significant adverse effects that this project would have on community character, visual environment and physical changes that would degrade this area. This DEIR is deficient and does not demonstrate in any way how these significant negative impacts would be mitigated.

Applicant should comply with their goals to create a project that is compatible with the surrounding area. DIER as presented does not accomplish this.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, LOCATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1.2.1 Project Component Parts Page 8 & 10

Community Design

DR Comment-

No mention of Fallbrook Guidelines in this section. These guidelines & the permitting process should be included in this section.

Grading and Construction

DR Comment-

Cut and fill slopes are inconsistently listed. Some sections state a max of 80 ft. others 100 ft. Regardless, this is an enormous amount of grading and will forever change the topography of the land. Changing the Land Use designation to allow these slopes, will not mitigate the changes in topography.

Land Use Planning Changes

In order to develop the Proposed Project, a number of land use and zone changes to the General Plan and the Fallbrook Community Plan are required. These include:

- Amend Regional Land Use Element Map to change the regional land use category from Special Study Area (SSA) and Rural Development Area (RDA) to Current Urban Development Area (CUDA);

2

DR Comment-

This is NOT an Urban Area.

- Amend the Fallbrook Community Plan to change the land use designation from (21) Specific Plan Area and (18) Multiple Rural Use to (21) Specific Plan Area for the entire Project Site; and

DR Comment-

This IS a rural Area

- Rezone the property from S90, Holding Area and A70, Limited Agriculture, to S88, Specific Plan Area.

DR Comment-

DEIR has not demonstrated in any way the necessity for these Land Use Changes.

These land use changes are addressed in more detail in Section 1.6, Inconsistencies of Project with Applicable Regional and General Plans and Chapter 4.1, Land Use an

1.6 Inconsistencies of Project with Applicable Regional and General Plans

As presented in the Land Use and Planning chapter of this EIR (Chapter 4.1), **the Proposed Project contains urban land uses and densities that are not consistent with the existing General Plan Regional Land Use Element regional categories of “Regional Development Area” (RDA) and “Special Study Area” (SSA) for the Project Site, and goals pertaining to preservation of rural lands.**

.....

The Proposed Project contains residential densities that are not consistent with the existing Fallbrook Community Plan (18) Multiple Rural Use land use designation for the eastern 297.5 acres of the Project Site

A General Plan Amendment and Rezone are proposed to bring the Proposed Project into conformance with the General Plan Regional Land Use Map, Land Use, Fallbrook Community Plan land use designation, and zoning.

DR Comments-

Fallbrook is a rural community. Our community plan reflects our rural lifestyle. While future development has been envisioned in this area, DEIR is overstating what was envisioned. Project proposes to change long standing ordinances that protect the beauty of this open space, to build a project that is huge in scale and completely out of character with the surrounding community. Project proposes to build a large urban project in a rural area.

As the DEIR states, the project is inconsistent with regional and general plans. DEIR has not demonstrated how amendments to Land Use designations would mitigate the project's significant impacts.

1.8.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, the Proposed Project will not result in growth inducing effects for the following reasons.

3

1. The Proposed Project is located in an area envisioned to support additional development as identified by the SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map, the I-15 Corridor Subregional Plan, the I-15/Highway 76 Master Specific Plan, and the General Plan Update. DR Comments-
DIER's conclusions are based on concepts & reference materials that appear outdated. While growth has been envisioned for this area, project densities far exceed this vision. DEIR does not demonstrate how their density is relevant or of public advantage, with today's economic conditions, the decline in long range housing projections and long term water shortages.
2. The additional housing is proposed in an area which is planned to support residential and commercial developments.
DR Comments-
Projects density exceeds what was planned.
3. Roadway construction will serve traffic from only the Proposed Project and two additional cumulative development projects for which applications have already been submitted, along with the approved Palomar College campus.
4. The area has anticipated growth since at least 1983 and is included in the 2007 Update to the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan.
DR Comments-

Although growth has been anticipated for this area, projections may be outdated. The necessity for this project's density has not been demonstrated. Additionally major water shortages for this area are anticipated for many years.

5. The proposed parks are scaled to comply with State and County requirements for parks and to serve the proposed number of homes.

6. The availability of a new school site would assist the BUESD in meeting the student enrollment demands created by the Proposed Project.

DR Comments-

In conflict with portion of DEIR that states that if the school is not built in 2 years, 42 DUs would be built.

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT Summary of Findings

VISUAL IMPACT EVALUATION Conclusions

DEIR states: The current project as proposed is incompatible with the rural character of Fallbrook

DR Comments-

DEIR lists

significant impacts in the Visual Impact Assessment Findings & Visual Impact Evaluation Conclusions, but goes on to say that these impacts can be mitigated to, or below, a level of significance by changing the current approved land use designations. DEIR has not demonstrated how this would be possible. Even with these amendments these impacts would still

4

be significant and unmitigatable and have a major negative impact on the area, the local population and the entire character of Fallbrook.

1. Summary of Findings

The following visual impacts are anticipated as a result of implementation of the Meadowood Specific Plan Amendment

1) The Visual Quality of the viewshed is anticipated to be impacted significantly due to major changes to the pattern character of the site as a result of the project....

This significant impact would be reduced to below a level of significance with the incorporation of the Meadowood Specific Plan Amendment Guidelines and design review process.

DR Comments-

DEIR does not demonstrate in any way how these significant negative impacts would be mitigated except by simply by changing the SPA & Design Review Process.

2) Manufactured slopes in excess of 100 feet, created by the project, will have a significant impact on the quality of landforms within the project viewshed....

This impact would be reduced to below a level of significance with the incorporation of the Meadowood Specific Plan Amendment Guidelines and design.

DR Comments-

DEIR does not demonstrate in any way how these significant negative impacts would be mitigated except by simply by changing the SPA & Design Review Process

100 foot slopes contracts applicants statement in Grading under Community Design Section that the slopes will be a maximum of 80 feet. Regardless, these slopes violate the FCP which prohibits grading that will unduly change the natural topography.

3) The existing community character of the valley will be significantly changed due to the density and arrangement of buildings and forms associated with the project....

This impact would be reduced to below a level of significance with the incorporation of the Meadowood Specific Plan Amendment Guidelines and design review process. .

DR Comments-

DEIR does not demonstrate in any way how these significant negative impacts would be mitigated except by simply by changing the SPA & Design Review Process

6) Short-term visible construction activities would contrast with existing conditions due to removal of existing vegetation and the introduction of new, visually dominant elements. **While temporary in nature and addressed through project design landscaping over the long-term, adverse visual impacts associated with construction activities would be significant but short term.**

DR Comments-

DEIR does not provide their definition of short term. If this project is anticipated to be done in phases over a period of many years, these impacts would not be short term.

5

7) **Significant cumulative visual impacts are anticipated when considering the project in conjunction with other cumulatively considerable projects . This impact is considered to be significant and unmitigatable.**

DR Comments-

This project by itself would create significant and unmitigatable impacts .DEIR states in other sections that significant impacts from this project can be mitigated by changes in land use. DEIR has not demonstrated why then, if this DEIR project's impacts could be mitigated simply by land use changes, would the project still add to cumulative impacts when considered with other projects? This does not make sense.

8.6 COMMUNITY DESIGN GOAL, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Goal

DEIR Lists significant impacts that would be reduced to, or below a level of significance. However applicant's conclusions can only be reached by changing the current approved land use designations. Even with these amendments, the results are unmitigatable and would have a major negative impact on the area, the local population and the entire character of Fallbrook

C. Project Description

The architectural character as detailed in the Fallbrook Design Guidelines would be incorporated into the design of Meadowood. The buildings would be limited to two stories and a 35-foot maximum height limit.

Non-residential buildings would have no strict design requirements but are limited to two stories and a 35-foot height limit. Non-Residential building should be subject to the same design requirements as residential buildings.

Development within Meadowood would be subject to the "B" designator in accordance with the Fallbrook Community Plan and I-15 Corridor Plan. This means that design proposals require Site Plan review for any development permit. The intent of the "B" designator is to address manmade and natural features which affect the scenic quality of the Fallbrook Community and the I-15 Corridor area. This will help to ensure that every new development carefully considers the community context in which it takes place and make a conscientious effort to develop a compatible relationship to the natural setting, neighboring properties and community design goals.

In contradiction to other sections- clarification needed so that ALL planning areas are subject to Fallbrook Design review for any development permit.

MEADOWOOD RESIDENIAL GUIDELINES

Site Design & Architecture

The Meadowood Residential Guidelines Site Design & Architecture shows residential units that are a maximum of two stories and height of 35 feet. We agree with this. The varied architecture styles are aesthetically pleasing.

However, the site design standards show an overall density that is completely out of character with the surrounding area, especially the medium density lots that are 47 x 55 and the high density neighborhoods.

DEIR states numerous times that the project will comply with the Fallbrook Design Guidelines. However, while each individual dwelling unit's architecture may be aesthetically pleasing and may appear to be consistent with the guidelines, dwelling units looked at together as a whole planning area or subdivision, are completely out of character with the applicant's goals to create a project that is compatible with Fallbrook's rural atmosphere and the surrounding environs, as required in the Fallbrook Design Guidelines, which states and is also noted in the DEIR....

A proper analysis will include a careful examination of a site's physical properties, its amenities, special problems, character and an examination of the neighboring environment."

DEIR states that certain planning areas will be subject to Fallbrook DR review and other areas will be subject to I-15 Corridor Design Review. All areas of this project should be subject to the Fallbrook Design Review permitting process.

Ms. Gebhart reported on the Parks and Recreation Committee's concerns:

The committee felt that in looking at the number of desired dwelling units Meadowood presented and their close proximity to one another, allowing no room for family recreation, additional parks should be added, and that the one small park now offered was completely inadequate. Motion by Carolyn Major:

"Open Spaces and Parks, active and passive, are presently inadequately represented. Housing density is too heavy without adequate parks and park amenities; such as, soccer fields, ball fields, basketball, volleyball, etc., within these high-density housing areas. Parks should be provided for each neighborhood and be centrally located within each neighborhood." Motion approved unanimously.

The committee reviewed pathways and trails, which look good. However, our primary concern is a staging area that has been requested in the past and has not currently been detailed on the maps. Additionally, we feel there is inadequate distribution of active and passive open spaces and parks within the high-density residential areas as presently represented. The community college and elementary school recreational areas should not be considered, as they are customarily fenced and locked during after school hours.

Committee Motion: "We also recommend that the 12.5 acre area presently proposed for an elementary school be dedicated to become a park and open space area if no school is built after completion of housing project."

Project Alternatives: Mr. Russell commented on his own concerns with the DEIR, primarily that the Alternatives presented in the report were poorly selected and evaluated in a questionable manor. This was clear in the findings the alternatives. For instance the environmentally sensitive development option that would increase the development unit counts to 1138 units. Or the finding that the no project alternative would extinguish agriculture in the area. The argument being that individual larger lots with agricultural features on them did not equate to postage stamp agricultural lots in a larger development which is not borne out in our community. Fallbrook is comprised of many large lots with agricultural features and that is what makes our community unique. Mr. Russell felt basically that the alternatives studied were inappropriate and the findings of the report were just wrong on what they did study. In Mr. Russell's view, these inconsistencies in Section 5 of the DEIR (alternatives section) invalidated the DEIR on the grounds that the CEQA guidelines to identify and study viable alternatives had not been met.

Mr. Walson commented on the fact that the project had not received a commitment from Rainbow Water and felt that it was inappropriate for the County to be considering the project without that commitment. Additionally in the water availability portion of the DEIR he did not understand how the report could identify that there would be more water availability in drought years than non drought years.

Ms. Walson commented on the school site issue and in her discussions with Bonsall School District understood that the District would require a turnkey school to be built in the area of the meadowood project. The idea of just making a site available for a limited time put the burden of constructing a school in the area to the tax payers and Ms. Walson felt that was in appropriate.

Mr. Tucker commented that he did not understand why the developer did not just go ahead with the current approval on the land for 500 plus units. While he felt that also was too much development in the area, it did have County approval and would have avoided all of the additional impacts the current development proposal would cause.

Mr. Christiansen commented on the traffic report in the DEIR:

The Traffic portion of the Meadowood DEIR is inadequate, incorrect, incomplete, wrong, and/or misleading for several reasons and mistakes:

- The Report projects total ADT of almost 9,000 vehicles for this project, but does not adequately include the possible traffic from the other projects in the NE Quarter of the I-15/SR76 junction.
- The Report was prepared by using standard methods of counting projected traffic volumes, the detail of which gives the appearance of being complete. But, the report does not realistically consider the cumulative, overall effect of the 40,000 to 50,000 possible ADTs that will be caused by the total development on the 1,000 acres in this area. There needs to be a subjective analysis of the future traffic in this area.
- The Report calculates Meadowood's project-generated traffic as being too small (in comparison to the other traffic in the area) to need much more than TIF fees or proportionate cost sharing for mitigation of the total cumulative traffic impacts.
- The result is that very little additional infrastructure is expected to be created to serve the traffic generated by this project. The only substantial benefit to be derived by anyone will be that the agencies (mainly CalTrans) will reduce their share of the costs for infrastructure improvements that would have been built anyway.
- The Report uses CalTrans data which assumes less than half of the traffic to and from this project will travel north or south on I-15, and that split will be equally north or south. This apparently comes from a belief that San Diego is the likely destination of commuting and other travelers, but our local knowledge that the Temecula area is much more important to our local residents (and presumably will be the same for the new people in the I-15/SR 76 area), and therefore the northbound traffic volumes should be re-visited.
- The Northbound I-15 traffic will all flow through the East Mission/Old 395/I-15 interchange complex, which CalTrans does not expect to improve within the next 30 years or more.
- The Report does not provide for any ramps to be built at the future diamond interchange to be located at the Stewart Canyon under-crossing of I-15. The Report ignores the continuous requests from the FCPG for construction of this interchange, and simply recites that there does not appear to be any "present need" for this intersection. Isn't the DEIR supposed to look to the future, not the present?
- The limited amount to be collected for "cumulative" impacts will presumably be spent all over the study area, which will also result in a lack of additional infrastructure. Given that the entire "3P" area at I-15/SR76 is substantially the same as development of a whole new town, it seems only reasonable that the funds to be generated from this area should be spent in the immediate area.

Mr. Russell asked that Ms. Burdick's comments on the Project Alternatives be added to the Planning Group's list, as follows:

Comments on Project Alternatives - Meadowood DEIR

Stated Goal of Meadowood's Project Alternatives: To evaluate the Project Alternatives based on their "ability to meet the basic objectives of the Proposed Project." This goal and this process assumes that the basic objectives are valid.

Invalid objectives

The following objectives for the Proposed Project are patently invalid:

Objective 1: Provide a variety of residential land uses to allow for residential development that ... (is) consistent with the rustic charm of Fallbrook.

"Variety" is a standard that applies to the entire community of Fallbrook, not a standard to be applied to a single project. Meadowood is not entitled to "variety." To reject any Project Alternative based on its inability to provide "variety" is a false objection.

There is nothing about any project of 800+ homes that can be "consistent with rustic."

Objective 2: Provide an opportunity for home ownership by increasing the housing supply with a variety of housing types in Fallbrook.

"Variety" is also mis-used as a standard in Objective 2 and is equally false as an objection to an alternative.

"Increasing the housing supply" can be achieved by a broad range of increases in the supply of housing. To reject alternatives because they do not "increase the housing supply" is a false conclusion based on an unspecific (and therefore unattainable) standard.

Objective 4: Provide for land uses that relate to the community in conjunction with the two neighboring projects.

Neighboring projects should not be a standard for comparison, especially when the neighboring projects are still in the proposal stages, and are as equally unacceptable as the Proposed Project.

Objective 6: Provide educational and recreational opportunities.

There is no assurance from Meadowood itself that their Proposed Project will provide any educational opportunities. Given current conditions, it is most likely that no elementary school will be built in the foreseeable future.

It is invalid to reject any Project Alternative because it does not meet Objective 6.

Issues with Grading

All the proposed alternatives violate the grading standards.

Issues with Density

Meadowood needs to provide a reasonable Alternative that is based on the density recommendation proposed by the Fallbrook Community Planning Group ever since 2005: 650 dwelling units.

All the currently proposed alternatives include too many units (or a combination of too many units when added to newly proposed commercial acreage) OR so few units that the County's goals for additional housing could not be met.

The "Multi-Family" designation is improperly used to describe single family units on 2,500 SF lots.

Issues with Wastewater Treatment Plant

The prospect of installing a wastewater treatment plant immediately adjacent to a residential development is a completely unacceptable proposal. All the proposed alternatives (*and* the Proposed Project) include the wastewater treatment plant directly adjacent to a residential area. Instead, a wastewater treatment plant needs to be located in an industrial area.

Addition of Commercial

It is clearly unreasonable to include two alternatives that replace residential areas with 1.8 acres of commercial when this project has never been approved for commercial.

Also added were two additional individual comments from Ms. Burdick:

Avocado groves at Meadowood

How will the 47.6 acres of avocado groves be maintained?

How will pests on the trees be controlled? (Assuming you'd have to spray by helicopter - and need 100' from homes, this could be a potential environmental danger to residents.)
What is the business plan for the groves? How will you maintain it? How will you market the fruit?
What is the compliance plan for water quality, especially taking into account the new agricultural waivers? (Nitrates will end up in the run-off and the landowner is held responsible, especially if reclaimed water is used.)

The two aquaducts serving the proposed project area are already at capacity in summer months. - Appendix O-1, p. 3-19

"The Water Authority currently operates the treated water pipelines in both aqueducts at or near their capacity during the summer months." EIR needs to address this additional restriction on the availability of water.

Mr. Bopf motioned to send all of the above comments to the Department of Planning and Land Use and the Developer. The motion was unanimously approved.

9. Discussion on the county staff's comments on the Fallbrook Community Plan for the General Plan Update. Community input. Voting item.

Mr. Russell suggested that the Planning Group authorize the Chair, Vice Chairs and Secretary to meet with the County and attempt to explain the concerns that Fallbrook Community Plan as presented to Department of Planning and Land Use addressed. The Planning Group agreed to the delegation.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 pm.
Tom Harrington, secretary